

**Rodac Corporation and General Warehousemen,
Local 598, International Brotherhood of Team-
sters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers
of America. Case 21-CA-20713**

March 17, 1982

DECISION AND ORDER

**BY MEMBERS FANNING, JENKINS, AND
ZIMMERMAN**

Upon a charge filed on October 8, 1981, by General Warehousemen, Local 598, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, herein called the Union, and duly served on Rodac Corporation, herein called Respondent, the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, by the Regional Director for Region 21, issued a complaint on November 5, 1981, against Respondent, alleging that Respondent had engaged in and was engaging in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Copies of the charge and complaint and notice of hearing before an administrative law judge were duly served on the parties to this proceeding.

With respect to the unfair labor practices, the complaint alleges in substance that on September 14, 1981, following a Board election in Case 21-RC-16611, the Union was duly certified as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of Respondent's employees in the unit found appropriate;¹ and that, commencing on or about September 30, 1981, and at all times thereafter, Respondent has refused, and continues to date to refuse, to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive bargaining representative, although the Union has requested and is requesting it to do so. On November 17, 1981, Respondent filed its answer to the complaint admitting in part, and denying in part, the allegations in the complaint.

On December 7, 1981, counsel for the General Counsel filed directly with the Board a Motion for Summary Judgment. Subsequently, on December 11, 1981, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice To Show Cause why the General Counsel's Motion for Summary Judgment should not be granted. Respondent

failed to file a response to the Notice To Show Cause.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the Board makes the following:

Ruling on the Motion for Summary Judgment

In its answer to the complaint, Respondent denies that a majority of the employees in the unit found appropriate validly designated and selected the Union as their representative for the purposes of collective bargaining with Respondent. Respondent also denies that the Board's certification of the Union as the exclusive representative of the aforesaid employees was valid.

Review of the record herein reveals that in Case 21-RC-16611 the petition was filed by the Union on December 22, 1980. The parties entered into a Stipulation for Certification Upon Consent Election agreement. The election was held on February 12, 1981. At the conclusion of the balloting, the tally revealed that 151 votes had been cast for and 51 votes had been cast against the Union. There were 21 challenged ballots. Respondent filed objections to the conduct of the election. On April 2, 1981, the Regional Director issued and served on the parties a Report on Objections in which he recommended that the election be set aside and a new election be directed. No exceptions were filed to the Regional Director's report. Accordingly, the Board, on April 21, 1981, adopted the Regional Director's recommendations as contained in his report.

The second election was held on May 28, 1981. At the conclusion of the balloting, the tally revealed that 118 votes had been cast for and 49 had been against the Union. There were 21 challenged ballots. Respondent filed objections to the conduct of the election. On July 7, 1981, the Regional Director issued and served on the parties a Supplemental Report on Objections in which he overruled Respondent's objections and recommended that a certification of representative be issued to the Union. Exceptions were filed by Respondent to the Regional Director's supplemental report. On September 14, 1981, the Board issued a Decision and Certification of Representative (not reported in volumes of Board Decisions) wherein it adopted the Regional Director's findings and recommendations and certified the Union.

Following a request by the Union, by letter dated September 23, 1981, that Respondent engage in collective-bargaining negotiations with the

¹ Official notice is taken of the record in the representation proceeding, Case 21-RC-16611, as the term "record" is defined in Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, Series 8, as amended. See *ITV Electrosystems, Inc.*, 166 NLRB 938 (1967), enf'd, 388 F.2d 683 (4th Cir. 1968); *Golden Age Beverage Co.*, 167 NLRB 151 (1967), enf'd, 415 F.2d 26 (5th Cir. 1969); *Intertape Co. v. Penello*, 269 F.Supp. 573 (D.C.Va. 1967); *Follett Corp.*, 164 NLRB 378 (1967), enf'd, 397 F.2d 91 (7th Cir. 1968); Sec. 9(d) of the NLR Act, as amended.

Union, Respondent, by letter dated September 30, 1981, refused to recognize and bargain in good faith with the Union as the exclusive bargaining representative of its employees in the certified unit.

It is well settled that in the absence of newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence or special circumstances a respondent in a proceeding alleging a violation of Section 8(a)(5) is not entitled to relitigate issues which were or could have been litigated in a prior representation proceeding.²

All issues raised by Respondent in this proceeding were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding, and Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege that any special circumstances exist herein which would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that Respondent has not raised any issue which is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.

On the basis of the entire record, the Board makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. THE BUSINESS OF RESPONDENT

Respondent is a California corporation engaged in the manufacture of pneumatic tools in Carson, California. In the course and conduct of its business operations, Respondent annually sells and ships goods and products valued in excess of \$50,000 directly to customers located outside the State of California.

We find, on the basis of the foregoing, that Respondent is, and has been at all times material herein, an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act, and that it will effectuate the policies of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.

II. THE LABOR ORGANIZATION INVOLVED

General Warehousemen, Local 598, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

III. THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES

A. *The Representation Proceeding*

1. The unit

The following employees of Respondent constitute a unit appropriate for collective-bargaining

purposes within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

All production and maintenance employees, warehousemen and truck drivers employed by the Employer at its facility located at 1005 East Artesia Boulevard, Carson, California; excluding all other employees, lead persons, office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

2. The certification

On May 28, 1981, a majority of the employees of Respondent in said unit, in a secret-ballot election conducted under the supervision of the Regional Director for Region 21, designated the Union as their representative for the purpose of collective bargaining with Respondent.

The Union was certified as the collective-bargaining representative of the employees in said unit on September 14, 1981, and the Union continues to be such exclusive representative within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

B. *The Request To Bargain and Respondent's Refusal*

Commencing on or about September 23, 1981, and at all times thereafter, the Union has requested Respondent to bargain collectively with it as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of all the employees in the above-described unit. Commencing on or about September 30, 1981, and continuing at all times thereafter to date, Respondent has refused, and continues to refuse, to recognize and bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative for collective bargaining of all employees in said unit.

Accordingly, we find that Respondent has, since September 30, 1981, and at all times thereafter, refused to bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the appropriate unit, and that, by such refusal, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES UPON COMMERCE

The activities of Respondent set forth in section III, above, occurring in connection with its operations described in section I, above, have a close, intimate, and substantial relationship to trade, traffic, and commerce among the several States and tend to lead to labor disputes burdening and ob-

² See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. N.L.R.B.*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941). Rules and Regulations of the Board, Secs. 102.67(f) and 102.69(c).

structing commerce and the free flow of commerce.

V. THE REMEDY

Having found that Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order that it cease and desist therefrom, and, upon request, bargain collectively with the Union as the exclusive representative of all employees in the appropriate unit and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

In order to insure that the employees in the appropriate unit will be accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of certification as beginning on the date Respondent commences to bargain in good faith with the Union as the recognized bargaining representative in the appropriate unit. See *Mar-Jac Poultry Company, Inc.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); *Commerce Company d/b/a Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), enfd. 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), cert. denied 379 U.S. 817; *Burnett Construction Company*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), enfd. 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

The Board, upon the basis of the foregoing facts and the entire record, makes the following:

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Rodac Corporation is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

2. General Warehousemen, Local 598, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

3. All production and maintenance employees, warehousemen, and truckdrivers employed by Respondent at its facility located at 1005 East Artesia Boulevard, Carson, California, excluding all other employees, lead persons, office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act, constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act.

4. Since September 14, 1981, the above-named labor organization has been and now is the certified and exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit for the purpose of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(a) of the Act.

5. By refusing on or about September 30, 1981, and at all times thereafter, to bargain collectively with the above-named labor organization as the ex-

clusive bargaining representative of all the employees of Respondent in the appropriate unit, Respondent has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) of the Act.

6. By the aforesaid refusal to bargain, Respondent has interfered with, restrained, and coerced, and is interfering with, restraining, and coercing, employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act, and thereby has engaged in and is engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 8(a)(1) of the Act.

7. The aforesaid unfair labor practices are unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

ORDER

Pursuant to Section 10(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board hereby orders that the Respondent, Rodac Corporation, Carson, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall:

1. Cease and desist from:

(a) Refusing to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with General Warehousemen, Local 598, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, as the exclusive bargaining representative of its employees in the following appropriate unit:

All production and maintenance employees, warehousemen and truck drivers employed by the Employer at its facility located at 1005 East Artesia Boulevard, Carson, California; excluding all other employees, lead persons, office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them in Section 7 of the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action which the Board finds will effectuate the policies of the Act:

(a) Upon request, bargain with the above-named labor organization as the exclusive representative of all employees in the aforesaid appropriate unit with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement.

(b) Post at its Carson, California, facility copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."³ Copies of said notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 21, after being duly signed by Respondent's representative, shall be posted by Respondent immediately upon receipt thereof, and be maintained by it for 60 consecutive days thereafter, in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by Respondent to insure that said notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material.

(c) Notify the Regional Director for Region 21, in writing, within 20 days from the date of this Order, what steps Respondent Union has taken to comply herewith.

³ In the event that this Order is enforced by a Judgment of a United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES
POSTED BY ORDER OF THE
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
An Agency of the United States Government

WE WILL NOT refuse to bargain collectively concerning rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with General Warehousemen, Local 598, In-

ternational Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, as the exclusive representative of the employees in the bargaining unit described below.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, upon request, bargain with the above-named Union, as the exclusive representative of all employees in the bargaining unit described below, with respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody such understanding in a signed agreement. The bargaining unit is:

All production and maintenance employees, warehousemen and truck drivers employed by the Employer at its facility located at 1005 East Artesia Boulevard, Carson, California; excluding all other employees, lead persons, office clerical employees, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

RODAC CORPORATION